



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAME INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/697,446	10/26/2000	David Bruce Kumhyr	AUS9-2000-0501-US1	3535

7590
03/01/2004
Kelly K Kordzik
100 Congress Avenue
Suite 800
Austin, TX 78701

EXAMINER

RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2124

DATE MAILED: 03/01/2004

3

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

du

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/697,446

Applicant(s)

KUMHYR ET AL.

Examiner

Satish S. Rampuria

Art Unit

2124

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 2124

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the application filed on October 26, 2000.
2. Claims 1-24 are pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449, Paper No. 02, is attached to the instant Office action.

Specification

4. The use of the trademark "Java" has been noted in this application. It should be appropriate or proper term (see MPEP 608.01(v)) used, wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology. Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

5. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2124

Regarding claim 1, the structure limitation does not limit the process of steps and or actions. Line 6-7, it is unclear whether it is step or action of the process. In the previous steps (lines 3-5) specifies the steps of the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurtzberg et al, hereinafter called Kurtzberg, US Patent No. 6,120,552 in view of Bowen et al, hereinafter called Bowen, US Patent No. 6,094,649.

As per claim 1, 7, and 8 Kurtzberg discloses:

- ***scanning a code*** (col. 3, lines “The characters in the string are sequentially scanned from left to right”) ***for a first pair of delimiters*** (col. 3, line 43 “the end-of-string delimiter”)

Kurtzberg, does not explicitly disclose the path name is a resource file.

However, Bowen discloses the path name is a resource file (col. 7, lines 45-49 “resource locators include URLs, hot links, file paths, and distinguished names, object class names, table names, and primary database key values, among others”).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of directing a path or file name to a different location as taught by Bowen in to the method of scanning code as taught by Kurtzberg. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to direct to a specific data base or directory depending on the data structure as taught by Bowen (col. 4, lines 20-28).

The limitation of non-externalized string that is not hard-coded which is also in the preamble of the claim is not given patentable weight since it does not specify step or action of the process.

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further Bowen discloses:

- identifying the string as a possible hard-coded string if said string is not a path name to said resource file (col. 4 lines 22-26 “One method of the invention begins... selection... one data... in the structured database; each selected item... data and has a corresponding location identifier which identifies the item's location within the structured database”)

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated:

Art Unit: 2124

- *wherein said code comprises Java code* (page 2, lines 17-18 “application... programming language... Java... implemented using objects”)

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated:

- *where in said path name is a uniform resource locator* (page 11, lines 8-9 “Path name to resource bundles... commonly referred... uniform resource locator (URL)”)

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated:

- *where in said resource file is a resource bundle* (page 3, line 18 “resource files commonly referred to in Java as resource bundles”)

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated:

- *wherein said string within said first pair of string delimiters is a path name to said resource file if said string is in a dot delimited notation* (page, 11, line 9 “URL’s are commonly identified by their dotted signature”)

Claim 9 is the product claim corresponding to method claim 1 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1 above.

Claim 10 is the product claim corresponding to method claim 2 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 2 above.

Claim 11 is the product claim corresponding to method claim 3 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 3 above.

Art Unit: 2124

Claim 12 is the product claim corresponding to method claim 4 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 4 above.

Claim 13 is the product claim corresponding to method claim 5 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 5 above.

Claim 14 is the product claim corresponding to method claim 6 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 6 above.

Claims 15 and 16 are the product claim corresponding to method claim 1 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1 above.

8. Claims 17-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kurtzberg, Bowen and further in view of Bell US Patent No. 6,275,978.

As per claim 17, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, neither Kurtzberg nor Bowen disclosed system with a processor, a memory, an input, an output mechanism, and a bus system coupling processor to memory unit, input mechanism, and output mechanism.

However, Bell discloses the system with a processor, a memory, an input, an output mechanism, and a bus system coupling processor to memory unit, input mechanism, and output mechanism (col. 3, lines 11-28 "the computer system... comprises a processor... a system memory... an operating system (not shown). The processor 41 accepts data from system memory 42 over the local interface or bus 43. ... user can be signaled by using the input devices... a mouse 44 and keyboard 45. The action input and result output are displayed on the display terminal 46")

Art Unit: 2124

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the system including a processor, a memory, an input, an output mechanism, and a bus system coupling processor to memory unit, input mechanism, and output mechanism as taught by Bell in to the combination system of scanning the code and link to resource locator as taught by Kurtzberg and Bowen. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have system which include processor, memory, input/output mechanism to implement, store, have user input and display the result.

Claim 18 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 2 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 2 above.

Claim 19 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 3 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 3 above.

Claim 20 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 4 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 4 above.

Claim 21 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 5 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 5 above.

Claim 22 is the system claim corresponding to method claim 6 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 6 above.

Claims 23 and 24 are the system claim corresponding to method claim 1 and rejected under the same reason set forth in connection of the rejection of claim 1 above.

Conclusion

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

The following patent is cited to further show the state of the art with respect to delimiter and files.

US Patent No. 5,414,841 to Bingham et al.

US Patent No. 6,076,084 to Harlan

US Patent No. 5,530,794 to Luebbert

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Satish Rampuria whose telephone number is 703-305-8891.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:30 A. M. to 5:00 P.M. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Kakali Chaki can be reached at 703-305-9662. The fax number for this group is 703-872-9306. An inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the group receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Satish S. Rampuria

Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2124

01/26/04

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'TODD INGBERG', with a large, sweeping flourish extending from the end of the signature.

**TODD INGBERG
PRIMARY EXAMINER**